



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,160	12/26/2001	Luc Desnoyers	P3030R1C3	4454

7590 09/02/2005

Ginger R. Dreger  
Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear  
Suite 1150  
201 California Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER

HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1649	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/036,160

Applicant(s)

DESNOYERS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-30 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27, 30 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28, 29 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/27/05 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. In view of the papers filed 6/27/05, the inventorship in this nonprovisional application has been changed by the deletion of Eaton, Pan, Stewart, Watanabe and Zhang.
5. Claims 28, 29 & 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1649

6. Claims 22-27, 30 & 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, for the reasons made of record in Paper No: 20050321, and as follows.

In contrast to Applicants' arguments on page 7 of the response, the mere statement on page 28 of the specification that "[t]he transmembrane domain has been *tentatively* identified as extending from about...", and that this "*may* be a type II transmembrane domain" [emphasis added] is inconsistent with Figure 20 specifically disclosing that N-myristoylation sites exist at 6 different positions between amino acids 77-310, which therefore, are *intracellular* versus extracellular because these are the putative sites where the scr protein binds to the cytoplasmic face of the plasma membrane. In other words, it remains unknown and not disclosed what amino acid residues are located within the "extracellular domain", if any such domain even exists, because nowhere in the specification is it specifically stated what portion of the PRO4405 polypeptide is "extracellular". Therefore, as previously made of record, redefining the extracellular domain as amino acids 77-310 after-the-fact still constitutes new matter.

7. Claims 22-27, 30 & 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

Art Unit: 1649

claimed invention, for the reasons made of record in Paper NOs: 20040831 & 20050321, and as follows.

In contrast to Applicants' assertions on pages 7-11 of the response, page 71 of the specification still specifically states that "[t]he PRO polypeptides described herein *may be isolated from a variety of sources*, such as from human tissue types *or from another source...* [emphasis added]". In contrast, the claims fail to recite that the claimed polypeptides are "isolated **human** polypeptides...". Thus, in contrast to Applicants' assertions, the courts holdings in *Vas-Cath*, *Fiers v. Revel*, *Univ. California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, and especially *Fiddes v. Baird* reasonably are reasonably applicable. Applicants then refer to Example 14 from the training materials for the written description guidelines. In contrast to Applicants' assertions, the claims do not define an open reading frame in a definable polypeptide (e.g., as it relates to base claim 22c), but instead encompasses undescribed amino acid sequences. The specification further fails to establish any disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, for the claimed PRO 4405 polypeptides, or establish any correlation with any other polypeptide known within the art with similar function, such as "catalyzing the reaction of  $A > B$ ". Lastly, claims 22-24 are distinguished from Example 14 in that these claims are not limited to "at least 95% amino acid sequence identity", as illustrated in Example 14, in which a reasonably correlation between structure and function may be possible for such a "claimed genus of polypeptides". Thus, Applicants' arguments are not persuasive for the reasons made of record.

Art Unit: 1649

8. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/036,160. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and alternate Fridays, from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.  
August 31, 2005

**ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D.**  
*Primary* **PATENT EXAMINER**